



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/751,022

01/02/2004

Eric A. Portman

10022/325

3692

33391 7590 11/14/2008
ACCENTURE INDY 33391
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
ONE INDIANA SQUARE, SUITE 1600
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204

EXAMINER

WIN, AUNG T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/751,022	PORTMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AUNG T. WIN	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-35, 37, 49, 60 and 66 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 36, 38-48, 50-56, 59, 61-63, 65 and 69-76, 78 & 79 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 36, 38-48, 50-56, 59, 61-63, 65, 69-76 and 78-79 filed on 07/01/2008 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. US Patent No. 7020251 cited in IDS filed on November 13, 2006 have been considered by examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 36, 48, 52, 53 & 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding amended Claim 36, Examiner cannot find any support in the disclosure to Claim's amended limitation "determining a contact preference for how to contact the subscriber terminal about the received contact information request with the information assistance application only when the information request is determining as not being automatically denied categorically or specifically" as cited in Claim 36 in combination with other limitations in the claim. Examiner requests the applicant specify the drawing, page, column or line number, which support the claim limitation. Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Regarding amended Claim 48, Examiner cannot find any support in the disclosure to Claim's amended limitation "specifically requesting a phone number associated with subscriber terminal and reply from the subscriber terminal to determine if permission to provide the phone number associated with the subscriber terminal to the wireless terminal was granted, and whether the user of the subscriber terminal has specified provision to the wireless terminal of additional contact information of the user of the subscriber terminal" and "where the response also include additional contact information specified by the user of the subscriber terminal" as cited in Claim 48 in combination with other limitations in the claim. Examiner requests the applicant specify the drawing, page, column or line number, which support the claim limitation. Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Regarding claim 52, Examiner cannot find any support in the disclosure to Claim's amended limitation "interpreting request via voice recognition and decipher information included in the information request message that is useable to identify the subscriber terminal" as cited in Claim 52 in combination with other limitations in the claim. Examiner requests the applicant specify the drawing, page, column or line number, which support the claim limitation. Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Regarding amended Claim 53, Examiner cannot find any support in the disclosure to Claim's amended limitation "performing voice recognition and natural

language processing to interpret that the contact information request message is specifically for a phone number when the contact information request is a verbal request" as cited in Claim 53 in combination with other limitations in the claim.

Examiner requests the applicant specify the drawing, page, column or line number, which support the claim limitation. Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Regarding amended Claim 59, Examiner cannot find any support in the disclosure to Claim's amended limitation "generating webpage comprising input fields configured to receive a contact information request" and "determination of identity comprises determination of a name of the requestor based on the unique information and corresponding requestor profile information included in a database accessible with the information assistance application" and "the reply also includes a selection of the selectable option" as cited in Claim 59 in combination with other limitations in the claim. Examiner requests the applicant specify the drawing, page, column or line number, which support the claim limitation. Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 36, 38-40, 43-48, 51, 54, 56, 59, 61-63, 65, 69-71, 72-75 and 78-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roundtree et al. (US20020004736A1) in view of Goldfinger et al. (US006449344B1), further in view of Futagami et al. (US006754665B1), Berkely et al. (US006546005B1) and Austin-Lane et al. (US20040059790A1).

1.1 Regarding Claim 36, Roundtree discloses a method of providing information assistance to a wireless terminal [wireless device: Figures 2 & 4] [wireless device: Figure 2], comprising the steps of:

receiving, from a wireless terminal operated by a requestor, a contact information request with an information assistance application located on an information assistance server, wherein the contact information request is a request for contact information of a user of a subscriber terminal that is other than the wireless terminal [requester using wireless device for requesting target person information with request processing

modules resided on system server: Figure 1 & 0031-0038] [also see request processing: 0025-0029];

identifying the requestor from unique information included with the contact information request [identifying caller ID of the requestor from target person information request: 0038] [identifying requestor from requestor ID included with the target person information request: 0062];

generating and transmitting an authorization request to request permission from the subscriber terminal to provide the contact information of the user of the subscriber terminal to the wireless terminal, wherein the authorization request includes an indication of an identity of the requestor based on identification of the requestor from the unique information; and receiving a reply from the subscriber terminal indicative of whether or not the requested information record is permitted to be provided to the wireless terminal; and generating a response for transmittal to the wireless terminal when the reply is indicative of permission to proceed with provision of the requested contact information of the user to the wireless, the response including only contact information identified by the user of the subscriber terminal as permissible to send to the wireless terminal [processing request based on system criteria: 0058] [0062-0064 & 0066] [also see 180, 188, 190 of Figure 6 & Figure 7].

Roundtree also teaches that system server maintain the personal information database and also determines whether to contact the subscriber for providing requested information of the subscriber to requestor [0058] although Roundtree does not explicitly teach that request processing server contacts the subscriber terminal about the

subscriber information request for authorization only when the information request is determined as not being automatically denied.

Goldfinger discloses the information providing method and system wherein information management apparatus determines not to provide subscriber information to requestor if subscriber requests to be asked to explicitly authorize whether to provide subscriber information to a requestor and transmit a request for authorization to subscriber based on subscriber request stored in information management apparatus [Column 6, Line 4-65]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention of made to modify the Roundtree information providing method and system not to provide subscriber information to requestor and to contact the subscriber terminal for authorization based on stored subscriber preference as taught by Goldfinger. One of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention of made to do so that request processing server contacts the subscriber terminal about the subscriber information request for authorization only when the information request is determined as not being automatically denied to provide efficient and improved information providing method and system.

Thus method and system as modified teach providing subscriber information based on subscriber permission but does not explicitly teach that accessing permissions of the subscriber to determine if the contact information request should be automatically denied categorically or specifically based on the identification of the requestor.

Futagami discloses information providing method and system wherein subscriber information is denied or provided categorically or specifically based on accessing

permissions information registered in personal information management server by subscriber and the identification of the requestor [Column 13, Line 31 – Column 14, Line 4-19] [Figure 15 & 16] [Column 2, Line 22-39].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention of made to further modify the information providing method and system to deny and provide subscriber information categorically or specifically to requestor based on accessing permissions information registered in personal information management server by subscriber and the identification of the requestor. One of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention of made to do so that request processing server contacts the subscriber terminal about the subscriber information request for authorization only when the information request is determined as not being automatically denied categorically or specifically as claimed to enhance improvement of information providing method and system.

Modified system and method as stated above does not explicitly teach a subscriber contact preference. Berkley disclose user contact information database comprising user's contact preference [Figure 2] [Ability to reach a user is subject to the user's preference: Column 8, Line 1-16] [Preferred communication option: Column 11, Line 55-Column 12, Line 35]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to further modify the system and method to contact the subscriber for authorization based on subscriber contact preference as taught by Berkley. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to do

this to process the calls efficiently and appropriately according to according to service subscriber's preference [Column 4, Line 25-30].

The system and method as modified above does not explicitly teach generating and providing requested information according to requestor format preferences as claimed. Austin-Lane et al. teaches generating and providing requested information to requestor based on format preferences of the requestor [requester receive requested information based on requestor delivery preference: 0035] [requested information: 0003] [delivery preference includes both text-based response (i.e., instant message) **and/or** voice-based response (i.e., audio or tactile alarm): 0035]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to further modify the information providing method as taught by Austin-Lane et al. to provide information based on requestor format preference as claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to do this provide improved information service according to service requestor's preference.

1.2 Claims 48 is rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claim 36 rejection because claimed executed steps are substantially close to claim 36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art that Method and system as stated above in Claim 36 rejection would teach requestor can request telephone number of subscriber terminal to information providing server using wireless terminal and subscriber can indicate access permission regarding additional information as claimed in authorization reply message because Futagami teaches that subscriber personal information is

subscriber telephone number [Futagami et al.: column 1, line 1-15 & Column 4, Line 6-12]. At the time of invention of made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that modified system and method would comprise computer readable medium storing claimed computer program executed by processor of wireless computing terminals and information providing server in order to execute the claimed steps accordingly.

1.3 Claims 59 are the system claim rejected for the same reason as rejections stated above in Claim 36 rejection because executed steps by claimed means substantially close to the corresponding steps of Claim 36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that modified system and method would teach claimed system because Roundtree teaches requesting information over World Wide Web [Roundtree et al. 0020 & Figure 2].

1.4 Claims 38, 61 are rejected for the same reason as Claim 36 rejection stated above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art that modified method and system as stated above teaches transmitting the response to the wireless terminal in accordance with communication preference i.e., according to contact preference i.e., voice and/or text response [see claim 1 rejection] according to user device transmission protocols, standards and device capabilities [see Figure 2 of Roundtree reference]. It should be noted that transmitting information based on compatibility of wireless device is also well known to one of ordinary skilled in the art at

the time of invention of made and expected in modified method and system because modified system and method teaches plurality of wireless devices capable of communicating via different networks employing different protocols and standards.

1.5 Claims 44, 45, 47, 56 & 65 are rejected for the same reasons as rejections stated above. Modified system and method teaches determining contact preference based on stored contact preference information database [See Claim 36 rejections as taught by Berkley et al. & Austin-Lane et al.]

1.6 Claims 69, 70, 73 & 75 are rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claims 36 and 59 because the system and method as modified would teach providing information based on subscriber authorized information as claimed [see claim 39 & 59 rejections]

1.7 Claims 39, 43, 46, 51, 54, 62, 63, 71 are rejected for the same reason as stated above. Austin-Lane et al. teaches generating and providing requested information to requestor based on format preferences of the requestor [requester receive requested information based on requestor delivery preference: 0035] [requested information: 0003] [delivery preference includes both text-based response (i.e., instant message) **and/or** voice-based response (i.e., audio or tactile alarm): 0035]. Therefore, modified method and system teaches as claimed in Claims 39, 43, 46, 51, 54, 62, 63, 71 & 79.

1.8 Claim 78 & 79 is rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claim 36 & 39 rejections because claimed method substantially close to corresponding method of Claims 36 & 39.

1.9 Claim 40 is rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claim 36 rejection because modified system and method teaches that personal information request as modified by Roundtree et al. in view of Futagami et al includes at least one subscriber information selected from a group of stored subscriber personal information comprising name, address, number etc. as claimed [see citations regarding requested information as indicated in Claim 36 rejection].

1.10 Claims 74 is rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claim 36 rejection stated above because Futagami teaches information providing system method comprising authentication and verifying requesting users before providing requested information as cited in claim 74 [Column 12, Line 30-42]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to further modify the method and system for authenticating and verifying the requestor as taught by Futagami authentication and verification method to implement the method and system as claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to do this to provide secured information providing service.

2. Claim 42 & 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roundtree et al. (US20020004736A1) in view of Goldfinger et al. (US006449344B1), further in view of Futagami et al. (US006754665B1), Berkely et al. (US006546005B1) and Austin-Lane et al. (US20040059790A1) and Sugiyama et al (US006345245B1).

2.1 Regarding Claims 42 & 53, modified method and system teaches the method of claim 36 and further teaches processing voice request via speech processor and voice to text conversion [Roundtree: 0031-0033], but does not explicitly disclose processing with Natural Language Processing module. Sugiyama teaches such claimed feature lacks in modified system [Background and Summary] for translating the transmitted information.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to utilize natural language processing system as claimed to process contact information request as claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to do this to provide improved information assistance system to process the request effectively [Sugiyama: Background].

3. Claims 50 & 72 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roundtree et al. (US20020004736A1) in view of Goldfinger et al. (US006449344B1), further in view of Futagami et al. (US006754665B1), Berkely et al. (US006546005B1) and Austin-Lane et al. (US20040059790A1) and Chaddha et al. (US20050020250A1).

3.1 Regarding Claims 50 & 72, modified method and system teaches as claimed in Claim 48 & 36 as stated above. Modified method and system further teaches transmitting the response to the wireless terminal in accordance with communication preference i.e., according to contact preference i.e., voice and/or text response [see claim 1 rejection] according to user device transmission protocols, standards and device capabilities [see Figure 2 of Roundtree reference] although does not explicitly cite that sending response based on compatibility

Chaddha teaches transmitting information to the communication terminal that is compatible with the wireless terminal [0047]. It should be noted that such claimed feature is well known to one skill in the art at the time of invention of made. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to further modify the method as claimed as taught by Chaddha. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made would have been motivated to do this to make improvement in information transmission system according to user's device communications capability.

4. Claims 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roundtree et al. (US20020004736A1) in view of Goldfinger et al. (US006449344B1), further in view of Futagami et al. (US006754665B1), Berkely et al. (US006546005B1) and Austin-Lane et al. (US20040059790A1) and Holvery et al. (US20040054935 A1).

4.1 Regarding Claims 41, 52, 55 & 76, modified method and system teaches the method of claims 36 & 48 as stated above further teaches processing voice request via speech processor and voice to text conversion [Roundtree: 0031-0033]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention of made that modified system and method would have been implemented with voice interactive response system utilizing voice recognitions and voice print technology with corresponding implemented database in identifying, authentication and processing the request based on authorization although does not explicitly cite utilizing voice recognition and voice print technology as claimed.

Holvery teaches information providing method comprising processing voice request, authenticating requestor and providing information based on authentication and authorization [0022 & 0023] via voice-print recognition process. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention of made to further modify the method in authenticating and authorizing voice telephone request in providing information as taught by Holvery to process voice request as claimed. One of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention of made to do this to enhance secured information providing method to voice requestor. It should be noted that claimed feature as claimed is expected in modified information providing system because voice recognition module implemented with speaker dependent and/or speaker independent technology to process the user voice to identify the meanings of intent of the words for user identification, request determination and authorization purposes are

well known to one of ordinary skills in information distribution art and the speech processing art at the time of invention of made.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AUNG T. WIN whose telephone number is (571)272-7549. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Eisen can be reached on (571) 272-7687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aung T Win/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

Application/Control Number: 10/751,022
Art Unit: 2617

Page 17